

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The office action dated December 7, 2009 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, claim 1 is amended. No new matter is added. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-12 and 21 are currently pending for examination, and claims 15-20 are withdrawn from consideration as the result of an earlier restriction requirement. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-12, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-12, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-12 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,063,339 to Tisone et al. (hereinafter “Tisone”). Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-12, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant’s admitted art in view of Tisone.

The rejections of claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-12, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs, are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Because Applicants have amended independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections are traversed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested.

The rejection of claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-12 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tisone is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. The rejection of

claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-12 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted art in view of Tisone is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable at least in that this claim recites a combination of elements, including, for example, "the number of supports being same as the number of the column or line of image display parts so that the syringes at one support dispense dispensing material to the image display parts at the corresponding support." The cited references do not teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated "Tisone et al discloses...the number of supports capable of corresponding to the number of column or line of image display part; and a plurality of syringes (512) affixed at each support (502) to dispense a material on the substrate, wherein the supports are independently driven (see Abstract form moving head and column 22, line 16-21 for independently provided dispenses).." However, Applicants disagree with the Examiner's statement. Tisone merely discloses "Alternatively, multiple dispensers 502 may be used either in parallel, as illustrated in FIG. 2, or independently of one another. Arrays of dispenser heads could also be configured together, spaced, for example, on 4.5 mm or 9 mm center-to-center, so as to provide array dispensing of 8, 16 or 64 drops simultaneously and/or in synchronous coordination." See column 22 line 16-21.

That is, in Tisone, although the multiple dispensers are disclosed, the relationship between the number of the dispensers and the number of the syringes is not disclosed. Thus, Tisone fails to teach or suggest at least "the number of supports being same as the number of the column or line of image display parts so that the syringes at one support dispense dispensing material to the image display parts at the corresponding support."

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and claims 2-3, 5-9, 11-12 and

Application No.: 10/717,542
Amendment dated March 8, 2010
Response to Office Action dated December 7, 2009

Docket No.: 8734.257 US

21, which depend directly and indirectly from claim 1, are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants believe the foregoing Response places the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: March 8, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Valerie P. Hayes/

Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant